## Pages 1 - 21

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable William H. Alsup, Judge

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS. ) NO. CR 14-00175 WHA

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,

Defendant.

San Francisco, California Monday, January 3, 2022

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## **APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiff:

STEPHANIE M. HINDS

ACTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 1301 Clay Street, Suite 340S Oakland, California 94612-5224

BY: NOAH F. STERN

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

For Defendant:

JENNER & BLOCK LLP 353 North Clark Street Chicago, Illinois 60654

BY: REID J. SCHAR, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED BY: Ana Dub, RMR, RDR, CRR, CCRR, CRG, CCG

CSR No. 7445, Federal Official Court Reporter

1	APPEARANCES: (CONTINU	ED)
2	For Defendant:	
3		CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP Worldwide Plaza
4		825 Eighth Avenue New York, New York 10019-7475
5	BY:	KEVIN J. ORSINI, ATTORNEY AT LAW
6		CLARENCE, DYER & COHEN LLP 899 Ellis Street
7	BY:	San Francisco, California 94109  KATHLEEN "KATE" T. DYER, ATTORNEY AT LAW
8		
9	Also Present:	Jennifer Hutchings, U.S. Probation
10		William B. Abrams
11		1519 Branch Owl Place Santa Rosa, California 95409
12		Sanca Rosa, Galliolnia 33103
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## Monday - January 3, 2022 1 9:01 a.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: Calling Criminal Action 14-175, United States 4 of America versus Pacific Gas and Electric Company. 5 6 Counsel, please approach the podium and state your appearances for the record, beginning with counsel for 7 the Government. 8 MR. STERN: Good morning, Your Honor. Noah Stern on 9 behalf of the United States. 10 11 THE COURT: Welcome. MR. SCHAR: Good morning, Your Honor. Reid Schar on 12 13 behalf of PG&E, and I'm joined at the table by Kevin Orsini and Kate Dyer. 14 15 THE COURT: Welcome to you. 16 MS. HUTCHINGS: Good morning, Your Honor. Jennifer 17 Hutchings on behalf of Federal Probation. 18 THE COURT: Ms. Hutchings, welcome to you. Thank you. Okay. We're here for the arraignment on a Form 12 that 19 20 arises out of the Zogg Fire and the felony complaint in 21 Shasta County. 22 So the first step is to read the Form 12 amended petition, 23 unless PG&E is willing to waive that. Are you? 24

MR. SCHAR: Yes, Your Honor, we will waive.

So you waive arraignment; is that correct? 1 THE COURT: 2 MR. SCHAR: Yes, we're waiving the formal reading of the arraignment. 3 THE COURT: All right. So to be very clear, we're talking 4 5 about the Form 12 that was filed on November 10 of last year; 6 correct? 7 MR. SCHAR: Correct. THE COURT: Okay. And that involves the -- all right. Ιt 8 actually covers both the Sonoma County case as well as the 9 10 Shasta case. Is that understood? 11 MR. SCHAR: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. So is there anything 12 13 more that needs to be done on that front, Mr. Stern? No, Your Honor. 14 MR. STERN: Okay. All right. So now we need to address 15 THE COURT: 16 whether or not the Government is able to go forward on proving 17 this before January 21. Your Honor, the Government is willing and able 18 MR. STERN: to go forward with proving the violations. 19 Because the Court may modify the conditions of probation 20 without any formal findings of a violation and because 21 22 the Government's understanding is probation is ending at the 23 end of the month, the Government believes it would be appropriate to take judicial notice of the violations and allow 24

for the process to play out in state courts in Sonoma and

Shasta counties.

However, the Government is willing and able to prove the violations. When the Government would be ready to do that, I think, would depend on what a hearing would look like. As you know, there are many charges in the two state cases; and my understanding is that at least in the Sonoma County case, there's a preliminary hearing scheduled for the beginning of February that I believe is scheduled to take place over 15 days.

So there is a fair amount of evidence to prove -- to prove that PG&E violated state law. I think this case could be pared down a little bit and could go forward over a shorter amount of time, but the Government would want to hear guidance from the Court about that.

THE COURT: What's the status of the case in Shasta County?

MR. STERN: Your Honor, I don't know. I spoke with an assistant D.A. there, just generally, because we -- we, you know, still, I guess -- I believe PG&E -- I don't -- we weren't totally sure whether PG&E is going to admit or deny the allegations. So we did some initial assessment in speaking with the D.A.'s Office to kind of understand the scope of those cases and see how we might be able to present it.

I don't think -- given the fact that we don't know yet whether there will be an evidentiary hearing, we haven't fully

planned out when witnesses would be available, that sort of 1 thing. But if PG&E were to deny the allegations, then that is 2 something we could do in short order and provide Your Honor 3 with additional information about the timing that 4 5 the Government would need. THE COURT: All right. Well, let me ask PG&E. 6 Does PG&E admit any part of any of the Form 12? 7 We do not, Your Honor. But I would like the MR. SCHAR: 8 opportunity to explain and perhaps elaborate a little bit more 9 on --10 11 THE COURT: Please go ahead. Thank you, Your Honor. 12 MR. SCHAR: Sure. 13 You know, as I'm sure Your Honor is unquestionably aware, for both the Kincaid and the Zogg fires, so the one in Sonoma 14 15 and the one in Shasta, there are separate ongoing criminal 16 proceedings in state court, though it remains unclear, 17 ultimately, what the final charges against the company will be 18 in relation to both matters. Specific to Kincaid, Your Honor, there is no actual 19 20 pending indictment. It's still proceeding on a criminal 21 complaint. And as Mr. Stern has alluded to, there is a 22 preliminary hearing set in that matter for February 8th where 23 the state has requested 15 court days to establish probable cause on the charges. 24

PG&E intends to defend that case. Obviously, it's very

difficult to meaningfully do so before the Government has offered their evidence of probable cause.

The Zogg Fire case, the one occurring in relation to Shasta, isn't even that far along at this point. There's no indictment. Again, only a criminal complaint. The preliminary hearing has not been set yet. And while the company has been provided some initial discovery, it is not clear at this point why they decided to proceed criminally rather than civilly or what the ultimate evidence would be.

Just to give you one sense of that, Your Honor, obviously, we've been in front of Your Honor on this issue. The big issue in that, in part, will be the actual tree that fell into the lines, the gray pine that's received a fair amount of attention. We've not -- we, PG&E, have not been provided access to that. That's supposed to happen in February. But at this point we actually have not been provided access to the tree that we believe caused the fire.

So we do deny the Form 12 as it stands right now and those charges. But we also agree, I think, with Mr. Stern,

Your Honor, that an evidentiary hearing ultimately is not necessary or appropriate at this -- at this stage.

These cases will play out fully in the state proceedings, both in Sonoma and Shasta. They're being prosecuted by very competent district attorneys there, and due process will provide the company ultimately with the information it needs to

defend itself in each of those proceedings.

And given that probation is near an end here and, of course, as Your Honor knows, you can implement whatever additional conditions, if you so chose, between now and the end of probation, trying to proceed here under these circumstances with an evidentiary hearing, given where the state cases are, we do not -- we do not feel is necessary at this time.

THE COURT: It seems to me that in the Zogg Fire, when we were having our hearings on that one back in 2020, that there had been a declaration that ordered you to find and submit in which one of your many contractors had said that he had marked that tree. He was a quality control guy named Larry somebody. And he had marked that very tree for removal and sent an e-mail to another of your contractors saying "Please do it," and then it never happened; it never got removed. There were some vague statements about a woman with a gun, but there was never any proof that it was on her property or that was the tree in question. It was just other trees that had to be worked in that area. And it looked to me like there was a serious question whether PG&E just dropped the ball.

And then that guy went back on the day that Cal Fire was there collecting the tree and said that was the -- either he said it was the very tree that he had marked or the coordinates were the same. It was something like that.

And I do know that Cal Fire -- it seems to me I have it

right here somewhere. Cal Fire said that, quote (reading):

"After meticulous and thorough investigation,
Cal Fire has determined that the Zogg Fire was caused
by a pine tree contacting electrical distribution
lines owned and operated by Pacific Gas and
Electric."

So one of the things that we hope for when we have criminals like PG&E that are on probation is that over the course of probation, they come to accept responsibility. I've learned in this job that's the first big step for any criminal to turn themselves around is to accept responsibility.

And in five years, you've never done that. You've never accepted responsibility for any of these fires until it's convenient to do so or you're just up against the wall and have to plead guilty.

You've had plenty of time to investigate the Zogg thing.

You know good and well that you started the fire. And yet you stand here and come up with good lawyerlike reasons why you can't accept responsibility. It's a very big disappointment to the Court. Five years of my life and your life and a lot of the public's life, the U.S. Attorney's life down the drain because you will not accept responsibility. I wish I could be able to say that PG&E has learned something from this probation. It has not. It is still as recalcitrant as ever.

All right. Since I've launched into you, I'll give you a

chance to respond. So go ahead, if you wish.

MR. SCHAR: Your Honor, you know, I understand the position and the words that you're saying.

I think I, on behalf of the company, fundamentally disagree that the company hasn't learned. I think it's become a safer company. We've talked about it. We've had so many hearings in front of Your Honor in so many different ways. But I don't think -- and I think the record is what it is. And I don't think, you know, rehashing it is necessarily going to change your view. But I do disagree with some of the statements that you've made.

And, you know, the ultimate question, again, it is for any probationer, but for any person who's put in a situation where they've been charged with something, is a full and fair opportunity to face those charges in the Court in which the charges are brought.

There may not ultimately be a significant dispute about the underlying facts. But there's a big difference, Your Honor, between being asked to admit to a series of facts without being provided the full evidence and, more fundamentally, from a due process perspective, being asked to admit to a criminal state of mind when there are unknown aspects of the case that are still pending.

**THE COURT:** What's unknown?

MR. SCHAR: We don't have the full evidence. We don't

have the statements --

THE COURT: You have enough evidence to know that that tree is the one that caused the Zogg Fire. It's quite clear. And you should have cut it down and you let it slide. And one of the reports got backdated.

And then your colleague, Mr. Orsini, stood up here and told me that there were three arborists who did not mark it, and failed to point out that there was an earlier one that had, indeed, marked it and that it, for some reason, did not get cut.

You know the facts, and you can size them up and accept responsibility.

I've had plenty of people on the criminal side on a

Form 12 come in on the very first day and say, "We admit it.

We did it." They go into drug rehab treatment, or they've got some reason for why they did it, and we try to work with them.

But at least they accept responsibility.

PG&E is recalcitrant. It only accepts responsibility when it's convenient to do so or when its back is up against the wall and it has no choice. That's my view. I'm sorry to say that, but it's been the whole history of PG&E from -- in this case, the original trial, everything.

All right. What does -- let me ask the Government.

They deny everything. They don't admit a single thing, not a single aspect of the Form 12. What do you want to do?

MR. STERN: Your Honor, the Government agrees with you and shares our frustration in that.

I think that a lot of this comes down to what remedies are available here in proving the violation. And based on my understanding of Your Honor's prior statements, I believe I heard Your Honor say that it was not available to you to extend PG&E's term of probation. The Government has put forth its position on that issue.

THE COURT: Well, you put forth a brief that seemed to say that it's an open question whether the law would allow that.

MR. STERN: Yes --

THE COURT: Is that true?

MR. STERN: -- Your Honor.

THE COURT: And at the time that I made those statements,
I did not realize that it was an open question. I thought it
was foreclosed by Ninth Circuit authority.

So if you, for example, made a motion to extend probation, I would give that serious consideration. I'm not saying I would grant it. I'm just saying that I did not realize it was an open question. And I'm not saying that it's the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do.

I believe I have been a total failure in this job with respect to PG&E. PG&E is just as recalcitrant, has learned nothing in this process; that is, it's killing people every year with wildfires. And I would have thought in

five years I could bring it under control, but I have failed.

I'm not sure extending -- that I'm the one that ought to be in charge if there's going to be any extension.

And I will say this. If PG&E is convicted in the state case or either of the state cases, I beg those prosecutors and judges not to give up on probation like they did in Butte County. PG&E needs to be under the probation of somebody. PG&E should go to trial and have to face probation for however long the state court will keep them under. And some judge like me up in Shasta County will be riding herd on them, or Sonoma County. That's what needs to be done in order to -- if we're ever going to bring PG&E under control.

So if you were to bring a motion to extend probation, I would give it serious consideration; but it would have to be all done before, I think it's January 21. And whether I would even do it or not, I'm not sure that's the right answer.

But I was unaware that it was an open question.

MR. STERN: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I understand now the argument for why it's open, and that's because Congress changed the underlying statute. I was unaware of that.

But it doesn't mean the Ninth Circuit would change its ultimate view. It might be that the Ninth Circuit would still say it's five years and five years max, end of story.

I hate to end probation feeling as if PG&E is continuing

```
to be a menace to society, but it's true.
 1
 2
          Every year you're killing people; you're burning up
     thousands of acres of land. And it's true that some
 3
     improvements have been made in the system. But why does it
 4
 5
     continue? That is, to me -- and why is it that PG&E is
     unwilling to admit error, unwilling to accept responsibility
 6
     for what it's done?
 7
          Okay. I'm going to leave it in the hands of
 8
     the Government. I'm willing to hold a hearing, even if it
 9
     means that on January 21 we're right in the middle of a hearing
10
11
     and it's pointless. But if the Government wants to proceed
     with a Form 12, I will give you the hearing date. But I feel I
12
13
     can't say more than that.
          So it's up to you to decide if you want to try to prove it
14
15
     up.
16
          MR. STERN:
                     Understood, Your Honor. Would the Court be
17
     willing to let us file a status statement --
18
          THE COURT:
                     Sure.
                             Yes.
                     -- in the next couple of days?
19
          MR. STERN:
20
                     In the next couple of days, yes.
          THE COURT:
          Are there any members of the press out there?
21
                                                         If so,
22
                       I'd like to say something to you.
     raise your hand.
23
                              (No response.)
                      I guess there's no member of the press out
24
          THE COURT:
25
             Possibly on the phone.
     there.
```

Well, I say this to the members of the press. 1 2 No, you're not a member of the press, are you? MR. ABRAMS: No, I'm not. 3 THE COURT: All right. Then please be seated. 4 I think the press should ask this question. Here's how 5 this is going to play out. It's going to play out like it did 6 7 in Butte County. PG&E will pay millions of dollars to these two counties and walk away as a convicted criminal, but it will 8 not accept probation, and the counties will acquiesce in that. 9 And I ask the members of the press to watch that carefully 10 11 and to hold the D.A.'s accountable to putting this company on continued probation at least somewhere. 12 13 Okay. Did you want to say something, sir? MR. ABRAMS: Please, Your Honor. 14 Tell me what it's about. 15 THE COURT: 16 MR. ABRAMS: Sure. My name is Will Abrams. I'm a PG&E 17 victim, and I'm here today to give a little voice to the 18 victims. No. I'm not going to -- I'll give you 19 THE COURT: one minute to say whatever you want to say, but this is not the 20 occasion for more piling on PG&E. All right? So you come up 21 22 here and say your peace for one minute. Thank you, Your Honor. 23 MR. ABRAMS: I've read all of your statements to me, and I 24 THE COURT: 25 have given you all the relief that I plan to give you.

ahead; make your statement. 1 Thank you, Your Honor. And I apologize. 2 MR. ABRAMS: am pro se, and I'm trying to do the best I can to follow the 3 procedures. 4 5 THE COURT: One minute. Please get to the point. MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 I do think that one of the things that we should be 7 considering is a victim restitution hearing. There are victims 8 that have been harmed by these probation violations, and 9 I think that that should be something that the Government 10 11 considers and Your Honor considers in terms of how we move There are also ways, as I submitted in my brief, to 12 strengthen the conditions of probation. 13 Believe me, I really appreciate all the work that 14 15 the Court has done, and I agree with every word that you said 16 coming into this. 17 I think there's substantial evidence that there should be resentencing, that PG&E should be held accountable. And as a 18 19 victim, I certainly don't want --20 Which fire were you a victim of? THE COURT: MR. ABRAMS: The Tubbs Fire, Your Honor. 21 Well, isn't that the one that's still under 22 THE COURT: 23 dispute?

MR. ABRAMS: It's not under dispute, Your Honor, no. This is one that was handled through the bankruptcy court. And

24

unfortunately, there are many victims like me that are still reliant, given that our settlement was based on 50 percent of PG&E's stock. Every time they cause a fire, we suffer. And we've been waiting for compensation.

THE COURT: Well, why did your lawyers agree to a deal where it was based on the stock?

MR. ABRAMS: Well, Your Honor, unfortunately, the PG&E investors had something to say about that. And it wasn't as straightforward of a decision as we had thought, and there were influences associated with that hearing.

But --

THE COURT: Well, you accepted a deal where it rode with the stock. And, okay. Look, every time there's a new fire, the stock value goes down and the value of your settlement goes down. And I had nothing to do with that bankruptcy. I take blame for a lot of things here, including the failure to rehabilitate PG&E in probation, but I am not responsible for what goes on in the bankruptcy court.

MR. ABRAMS: Absolutely.

THE COURT: All right. So don't blame that one on me.

MR. ABRAMS: I'm not.

THE COURT: And I cannot just reach out like God and say:

Bankruptcy court, change this.

I'm sorry that you got a raw deal. You did get a raw deal. But I'm not the remedy.

Understood, Your Honor. And that's why 1 MR. ABRAMS: I think restitution is different than what they did in 2 bankruptcy. Anyway, that's what I think would be appropriate 3 in this case because there are harms above and beyond whatever 4 5 the bankruptcy court did that PG&E has done towards victims, 6 and they deserve to have a hearing to understand those harms so that the Court can consider it before the 21st. 7 If that includes resentencing, if that includes 8 strengthening a condition of probation, whatever that remedy 9 10 might be. But I think that having that come forward --11 THE COURT: All right. MR. ABRAMS: -- would be a --12 13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I've heard you out. I give you this one word. You should talk to the 14 15 U.S. Attorney and see if you can convince the United States 16 Attorney to try to extend probation. I'm not saying I would 17 grant it or not. I don't know. But I'm not going to -- if the United States Attorney doesn't move for it, then I'm not going 18 19 to do it, period. 20 MR. ABRAMS: Understood. Thank you, Your Honor. So it would have to be a -- and even then, I 21 THE COURT: 22 might not grant it. We'd have to have a whole hearing and so 23 But maybe Mr. Stern will hear you out.

They're living in tiny, little huts, waiting to be paid while

24

25

I will say this. The victims have gotten a raw deal.

```
the former judge who's running that thing is being paid a
 1
     thousand dollars an hour and nobody -- none of the victims are
 2
     getting any money. It's a raw deal. But that's the deal that
 3
     you victims accepted through your lawyer and the bankruptcy
 4
 5
             I'm sorry. I don't like it either, but I can't solve
 6
     every problem. All right?
          MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, Your Honor.
 7
          MR. STERN: Your Honor, if I just may say something for
 8
     the record.
 9
          Your Honor, based on -- just for one, to respond to
10
11
    Mr. Abram's comments, just based on the PSR, I don't believe
     restitution would be available through these proceedings.
12
          But I also just wanted to say that the Government
13
     respectfully disagrees with your assessment that this probation
14
15
     has been a total waste. It's true that PG&E stands here and
16
     denies the allegations right now, but I think the Monitor's
17
     report show that PG&E has made significant progress in some
18
     respects.
          And this case was about gas pipelines, a gas pipeline
19
20
     explosion in San Bruno. And according to the Monitor, PG&E has
21
     made substantial progress --
22
                      I agree with what you just said.
          THE COURT:
23
          MR. STERN:
                     -- on that issue.
          THE COURT: I agree with that.
24
25
          MR. STERN: And so --
```

THE COURT: I overstated it. You're correct.

MR. STERN: And with respect to the fire aspect and fire safety, which came into this case much later, PG&E has also made progress on that. The Monitor has reported numerous occasions where without things that got put into place because of this Court's oversight of PG&E through the probation, that fires would have been started, whether that be a PSPS or something else. There have been things that have flowed out of this probation that has made the public safer.

And so I just wanted to state for the record that I think that this probation has been effective in making progress. I agree that PG&E has not become an offender who is just, you know, willing to take full responsibility for things. And it seems, based on the record in this proceeding, that -- it seems very likely that, you know, they did commit a crime and they could admit to that, and it's frustrating that they didn't. But I don't think that this probation has been a total waste.

And at Your Honor's suggestion, we will consider -- consider your comments and let you know.

THE COURT: All right. "Total waste" is an overstatement by my. I agree with you. But the amount of progress that we have made is not something to congratulate ourselves over when fires of the size of the fire up in Butte County and Plumas County continue; they just continue. Entire towns get

burned down. And you would have thought in five years that 1 could have been brought under control, but it hasn't been. 2 All right. So I'm going to wait for the Government to 3 decide what it wants to do. And this could be our last 4 5 hearing. Maybe not. It's up to the Government. 6 Thank you. Unless there's more, we'll adjourn. Anything more? 7 MR. SCHAR: No, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 9 MR. STERN: Thank you, Your Honor. 10 11 MS. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Your Honor. Court is adjourned. 12 THE CLERK: (Proceedings adjourned at 9:30 a.m.) 13 ---000---14 15 16 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 17 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 18 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 19 20 Monday, January 3, 2022 DATE: 21 22 23 Ana Dub, CSR No. 7445, RDR, RMR, CRR, CCRR, CRG, CCG 24 Official United States Reporter 25